

Applicants: GUPTA, Ajay et al.
Serial Number: 10/812,388
Page 8

Assignee: Intel Corporation
Attorney Docket: P-6581-US

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claims 2-3, 11-12, 17-18, 20-21, and 29-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22 and 28 have been amended. Consequently, claims 1, 4-10, 13-16, 19, and 22-28 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 16, 19, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Krantz et al., U.S. Application No. 2004/011520. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the current amendments and the remarks that follow.

Each of amended independent claims 1, 10, 16, 19, and 28 recites in paraphrase, *inter alia*, receiving a wireless probe signal from a wireless access point including an indication that the wireless access point supports the certain configuration protocol, wherein the wireless probe response signal includes a first string indicating a unique identifier of the wireless access point, and determining at the wireless communication station whether the wireless communication station is authorized to configure the wireless access point based on a comparison of the first string to a second string entered in response to a user query at the wireless communication station.

Krantz does not disclose or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 1, 10, 16, 19, and 28. In particular, Krantz does not disclose a comparison at the wireless communication station of a first string indicating a unique identifier of a wireless access point with a second string entered in response to a user query at the wireless communication station. As stated in Krantz paragraph 0076, Krantz's credentials are sent to a server for comparison with entries in a database. This comparison is different from

Applicants: GUPTA, Ajay et al.
Serial Number: 10/812,388
Page 9

Assignee: Intel Corporation
Attorney Docket: P-6581-US

Applicants' comparison of a transmitted first string with a second string entered in response to a user query at a wireless communication station.

For a reference to anticipate a claim, each element of the claim must appear in the reference. Therefore, Krantz does not anticipate claims 1, 10, 16, 19, and 28, as amended.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 10, 16, 19, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Krantz should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 11-13, 17-18, 20-22, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz, U.S. Patent No. 7,289,813. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2-4, 11-13, 17-18, 20-22, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 11-12, 17-18, 20-21, and 29-30 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot. Each of claims 4, 13, and 22 depends from one of independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and includes all of the features of their respective independent claim as well as additional features.

As stated above, Krantz does not disclose a comparison at the wireless communication station of a first string indicating a unique identifier of a wireless access point with a second string entered in response to a user query at the wireless communication station. Karaoguz also fails to disclose this comparison. Karaoguz's device makes its determination regarding establishing communication without a comparison with a string entered in response to a user query: "The available wireless device at the juncture can determine whether or not to establish communication with the originating device locator. Or the available wireless device can automatically response and attempt to establish communication with the originating device locator." (Karaoguz, column 5, lines 17-23). Therefore, neither Krantz nor Karaoguz, alone or in combination, renders obvious independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and claims 4, 13, and 22 dependent therefrom.

Applicants: GUPTA, Ajay et al.
Serial Number: 10/812,388
Page 10

Assignee: Intel Corporation
Attorney Docket: P-6581-US

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-4, 11-13, 17-18, 20-22 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 14-15 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro, U.S. Application No. 2004/0076300. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5-7, 14-15, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 5-7, 14-15, and 23-25 depends from one of amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and includes all of their features as well as additional distinguishing features.

As discussed above, each of claims 1, 10 and 19 is patentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz. The addition of Ishidoro fails to cure the deficiencies of Krantz and Karaoguz. In particular, Ishidoro does not disclose a comparison at the wireless communication station of a first string indicating a unique identifier of a wireless access point with a second string entered in response to a user query at the wireless communication station. Ishidoro discriminates and registers user terminals by MAC address (Ishidoro, paragraphs 0046 and 0048). Therefore, none of Krantz, Karaoguz, and Ishidoro, alone or in combination renders obvious claims 5-7, 14-15, and 23-25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5-7, 14-15, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-9 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro and Rector, U.S. Application No. 2003/0212802. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being

Applicants: GUPTA, Ajay et al.
Serial Number: 10/812,388
Page 11

Assignee: Intel Corporation
Attorney Docket: P-6581-US

unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro and Rector should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 8-9 and 26-27 depends from one of independent claims 1 and 19 and includes all of their features as well as additional distinguishing features. As discussed above, claims 1 and 19 are patentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro. The addition of Rector fails to cure the deficiencies of Krantz and Karaoguz.

In particular, Rector does not disclose a comparison at the wireless communication station of a first string indicating a unique identifier of a wireless access point with a second string entered in response to a user query at the wireless communication station. Therefore, none of Krantz, Karaoguz, Ishidoro, and Rector alone or in combination renders obvious claims 8-9 and 26-27.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8-9 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Krantz in view of Karaoguz and further in view of Ishidoro and Rector be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, and for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Applicants: GUPTA, Ajay et al.
Serial Number: 10/812,388
Page 12

Assignee: Intel Corporation
Attorney Docket: P-6581-US

No fees are believed to be due associated with this paper, however, if any fees are due, please charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

Caleb Pollack
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,912

Dated: June 10, 2008

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP.
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10036
Phone: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801